

*Application No. 10/664,893
Response dated 09/28/2007*

REMARKS

Claims 35-54 are pending in the application. Claims 15-34 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 35-54 have been added by the foregoing amendment. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claim 26.

No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment. The description supporting the new claim language (i.e. claim language that has not been submitted previously) may also be found in the Specification (for example, at page 8, lines 4 to page 10, line 8).

New claims 35-48 are directed to a system that provides for a first observer to view two electronically generated images in addition to the normal optically generated view of an object. One of the electronically generated images is generated in dependence of an optical setting and the other is generated independently. A second observer perceives an optically view of the object.

New claims 49-54 are directed to a method for displaying a magnified image of an object to plural observers. Two distinct representations of two different input images are electronically generated. Both of these representations are displayed to a first observer. One of the representations generated dependent on an optical parameter while the other of the representations is generated independently.

Claims 15-22, 25, 27-30, 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,661,752 (Spink et al.). Claims 23, 24, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Spink et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,002,375 (Hoppl et al.). Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are overcome by the new claims and in view of the following remarks.

Page 10 of 12

*Application No. 10/664,893
Response dated 09/28/2007*

Applicants' invention is directed to a microscopy system for observing an object by plural observers. As recited in new claim 35 for example, the microscopy system comprises: at least one objective lens arrangement for receiving an object side beam emanating from an object plane and for transforming the object side beam into an image side beam, a first ocular system arranged to enable a first observer to observe the object by looking into the first ocular system, a second ocular system arranged to enable a second observer to observe the object by looking into the second ocular system and a controller.

The first ocular system comprises at least one first ocular tube having at least one first ocular for generating an image of the object plane from the image side beam, and at least one first image projector having a first display for superimposing an image displayed by the first display with a beam path of the first ocular system such that the image of the object plane is perceived by the first observer in superposition with the image of the first display.

The second ocular system comprises at least one second ocular tube being distinct from the at least one first ocular tube and having at least one second ocular for generating an image of the object plane from the image side beam wherein at least one optical setting of the first ocular system is adjustable independently of a corresponding optical setting of the second ocular system.

The controller is configured to generate the image displayed by the first display of the first ocular system from a first input image based on the at least one optical setting of the first ocular system, and from a second input image independent of the at least one optical setting of the first ocular system.

In addition to the arguments presented previously, Spink fails to disclose exemplary embodiments as recited in new claim 35 (and claim 49). Spink fails to teach or suggest handling

Application No. 10/664,893
Response dated 09/28/2007


the generation of the images displayed by the first and second displays differently. Spinks also fails to teach or suggest distinguishing between the first and second input images. Spink further fails to teach or suggest the optical setting being based on the superimposition of the image.

At least for these reasons, it is believed that independent claims 35 and 49 are allowable over Spink et al. The remaining claim, all of which depend on one of allowable claims 35 and 49 are also allowable based at least on their dependence.

All of the rejections having been overcome, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to expediting the prosecution of this application, he is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Potomac Patent Group PLLC

By: 
Krishna Kalidindi
Reg. No. 41,461

P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, VA 22404
703-893-8500

Date: September 28, 2007